DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 405 435 UD 031 600

AUTHOR Comeau, Mary T.
TITLE U.S. Racial Ideology and Immigrant/Refugee Policy: Effects on Asian-American Identity, Community Formation and Refugee Education Initiatives.
PUB DATE 96
NOTE 70p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Acculturation; *Asian Americans; Community Education; *Ideology; *Immigrants; Immigration; *Public Policy; Racial Differences; *Racial Identification; Refugees; Social Science Research; *Stereotypes; Theories
IDENTIFIERS Indochina; *Model Minority Groups; United States

ABSTRACT

Two papers explore racial ideology and policy toward immigrants and refugees in the United States. The first paper, "Race Theory Paradigms and Immigrant/Refugee Identity and Incorporation," asserts that the United States is a race-based society in which newcomers to the country have a racial identity imposed upon them. A review of the social science literature offers evidence of the sociohistorical construction of the concepts of "race," "immigrant," and "refugee." The evolution of race theory in the United States can be examined chronologically and divided into paradigm categories of biology, ethnicity, class, nationalism, and racial formation. The prevailing racial ideology influences immigrant policy and then affects immigrants' rights and their incorporation into the host society and their access to social welfare. An example is provided in the situation of Indochinese refugees, who entered the country with the assigned unique category of "allied alien," but who have become aligned with both the Asian American model minority stereotype and stereotypes of illegal aliens. The second paper, "Collective Organization and Action around Racial Identity," discusses organizations formed by immigrant groups and their leadership in the context of U.S. immigrant policy. Indochinese refugees provide an example of the way in which resettlement assistance can lessen the role of self-help groups, even as the government funds acculturation and cultural maintenance programs. Participation by the Indochinese in pan-Asian organizations also remains limited. Implications for community education initiatives for refugees and immigrants are discussed. (Contains 164 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 405 435

UD

U.S. RACIAL IDEOLOGY AND IMMIGRANT/REFUGEE POLICY: EFFECTS ON ASIAN-AMERICAN IDENTITY, COMMUNITY FORMATION AND REFUGEE EDUCATION INITIATIVES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary T. Comeau

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Mary T. Comeau
Center for International Education
School of Education
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts 01003

November 1, 1997

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UD031600

ABSTRACT

U.S. RACIAL IDEOLOGY AND IMMIGRANT/REFUGEE POLICY: EFFECTS ON ASIAN-AMERICAN IDENTITY, COMMUNITY FORMATION AND REFUGEE EDUCATION INITIATIVES

Mary T. Comeau
Center for International Education
School of Education
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts 01003

Paper One

The United States is a race-based society. Newcomers to the U.S. have had a certain racial identity imposed upon them. A review of literature in the fields of education, sociology, anthropology, political science, refugee studies and Asian-American studies offered evidence of the sociohistorical construction of the concepts of "race", "immigrant" and "refugee". The historical background of race and ethnic relations is explored within the American immigrant/refugee experience. The evolution of race theory in the United States can be examined chronologically and divided into paradigm categories of biology, ethnicity, class, nationalism and racial formation. Immigration policy is influenced by racial ideology. The resultant state intervention has influenced immigrant/refugee identity formation and incorporation into the host society. This incorporation determines rights and social welfare access. The state's response to

Indochinese refugees was to place them into a unique category of "allied alien". American nativism has overridden this initial identity and Indochinese refugees have been aligned with both Asian American model minority and illegal alien classifications.

Paper Two

New immigrant and refugee groups are extremely diverse: they differ both from existing groups, other new groups and among themselves. U. S. racial formation imposes and institutionalizes a racial identity which affects collective organization and action within these communities. Various forms of organization and definitions/roles of leaders were analyzed in terms of native country organization and leadership structures and U.S. government policy influenced structures. State incorporation involves a conflict between the western welfare state and indigenous forms of self help. U.S. racial formation processes have affected both the process and content of ethnic mobilization and organization. The U.S. provides resettlement assistance to Indochinese refugees, lessening the role of self-help organizations. Conversely it funds MAAs to offer acculturation-aimed and cultural maintenance programs. Indochinese refugees have yet to widely accept the racial appellation of Asian American. Participation by Indochinese refugees in pan-Asian organizations is also still limited. Implications for refugee/immigrant community education initiatives are discussed in the conclusion.

III

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT II

Paper

I. RACE THEORY PARADIGMS AND IMMIGRANT/REFUGEE IDENTITY AND INCORPORATION. 1

Definitions for Discussing Race Theory 3
Framework for Discussing Race Theory 5
Biological Paradigm 6
Ethnicity Paradigm 9
Class Paradigm. 13
Nationalism Paradigm 16
Racial Formation Paradigm. 17
Definitions for Discussing Refugees and Immigrants . . . 23
Immigration legislation and state incorporation of Indochinese refugees 25
Conclusion 31

II. COLLECTIVE ORGANIZATION AND ACTION AROUND RACIAL IDENTITY. 34
Types of Refugee/Immigrant Organizations and Collective Actions 36
Ethnic Enclaves 37
Ethnic Community Organizations 40
Mutual Assistance Organizations 43
Pan-Asian Organizations 47
Analysis 51

BIBLIOGRAPHY 54

PAPER I

U.S. RACIAL IDEOLOGY AND IMMIGRANT/REFUGEE POLICY: EFFECTS ON ASIAN AMERICAN[1] IDENTITY, COMMUNITY FORMATION AND REFUGEE EDUCATION INITIATIVES

Smedley (1993) and others have contended that race is a worldview. In that sense, it can also be asserted that race is a curriculum; an environment in which learning occurs. In addition to school curriculum, there is a societal curriculum, the lifelong education that is received through channels of family, friends, neighborhoods, the media. Curriculum can also be thought of as a conceptual framework and process of learning. Curriculum encompasses the learners' gender, nationality, class, sexual orientation, family situation, language and literacy background. These factors are centered within the social, economic and political institutional history which has shaped the identity of the individuals.

An understanding of race as the worldview that permeates U.S. society is necessary for an understanding of factors affecting newcomer identity formation. One can become "racial curriculum literate" - to become aware and critical of the agendas and historical background that have influenced immigrant and refugee incorporation in the U.S.

Examination of Indochinese[2] migration to the United States and subsequent identity development must be examined through a multidisciplinary

---

[1] The imperfect term Asian-American will be used in this paper to describe U.S. citizens of Pacific Islander roots.

[2] Since political independence from France in 1953-54, "Indochina is no longer a political entity. The term "Indochinese" generalizes the political, economic and cultural autonomy of Vietnamese, Laotian, and Khmer populations. However, Indochinese refugees is a more useful designation than Southeast Asian refugees.

approach including findings in the fields of education, sociology, anthropology, political science, refugee studies, and Asian American studies. Questions to be addressed include:

1. What have been the paradigms surrounding racial dynamics in twentieth century United States?

2. How does race dialogue with individual/group identities of various newcomer groups?

3. How does race dialogue with state incorporation of immigrants and refugees?

4. What is the intersection between immigrant and refugee experiences?

This paper will explore the historical background of race and ethnic relations and it's relation to the American immigrant and refugee experience. The focus will be on the experiences of Asian American immigrants and Indochinese refugees. Indochinese refugees have an Asian American identity imposed upon them when they arrive in the United States. Pan-Asian identity has been variously rejected and utilized politically by Asian Americans and newcomer Indochinese refugees.

Paper One begins with a brief overview of major racial dynamics theory in the U.S. during the twentieth century that have shaped the incorporation of voluntary and involuntary immigrants and refugees. Examples from Asian American history will accompany each section. The second half of the paper will explore how a racial worldview in the U.S. influences two functions of the

---

The latter term can encompass refugee populations other than Vietnamese, Laotian, and Khmer such as

state in regards to immigrant/refugee incorporation - providing social welfare and regulating cultural pluralism. State intervention creates a unique Indochinese refugee racial and political identity.

Definitions for Discussing Race Theory

Omi & Winant (1994) argued for the analysis of contemporary U.S. racial dynamics:

> Until we understand the concept of race, it is impossible effectively to analyze the familiar issues which involve race. It is hard to grasp the way racial identity is assigned and assumed, or to perceive the tacit racial dimensions of everyday experience, for example, without a clear sense of the socially constructed meaning of race. Similarly, without an awareness that the concept of race is subject to permanent political contestation, it is difficult to recognize the enduring role race plays in the social structure - in organizing social inequalities of various sorts, in shaping the very geography of American life, in framing political initiatives and state action. Nor is it possible to acknowledge or oppose racism without comprehending the sociohistorical context in which concepts of race are invoked. (p. vii)

Race is an arbitrary value system. Race[3] as a worldview[4] is a recent structure that was the outcome of western European colonialism during the last five centuries. Smedley (1993) listed the common characteristics of a race-based social structure as:

Burmese and residents of Timor.

[3] Smedley (1993) defined race as "...a shorthand term for, as well as a symbol of, a "knowledge system"; a way of knowing and looking at the world and of rationalizing its contents (in this case, other human beings) in terms that are derived from previous cultural-historical experience and reflective of contemporary social values, relationships, and conditions" (p. 15).

[4] Smedley (1993) wrote, "By worldview I mean a culturally structured, systematic way of looking at, perceiving, and interpreting various world realities, a society's "weltanschauung", to use a word made popular in sociological studies" (p. 17). She used the terms "worldview" and "ideology" interchangeably while adding that worldview is "...a more systematic and comprehensive set of ideological beliefs that have an integral relationship to one another" (p. 18).

1. All have race classifications identified in law;
2. All structure racial classifications hierarchically;
3. All associate stereotyped behavior with each race category;
4. All hold, in an abstract sense, that racial characteristics are innate and unalterable. (p. 9)

Influences on European racial ideology development include historical contact or non-contact with non-Europeans, religious beliefs, national ethnocentrism and a hierarchical natural and social world order belief system (Smedley, 1993; p. 41). The United States developed the most rigid and exclusionist form of race ideology beginning with seventeenth century English colonial settlements[5]. Unique to the United States is the inflexible and nontranscendent dichotomy of black and white categories with black being defined as someone having any known black ancestors.[6]

The terms race, culture, and ethnicity all share a legacy of multiple and often contradictory definitions. Where Smedley (1993) defined "race" as a worldview or ideology, she suggested culture was quite different:

> Culture is learned, not inborn, behavior; it refers to ways of behaving and thinking that we learn as we grow up in any society. It also refers to the things we learn when we adapt to or assimilate features of a different culture. The terms, "ethnic" and "ethnicity" are best used, analytically, to refer to all those traditions, customs, activities, beliefs, and practices that pertain to a particular group of people who see themselves and are seen by others as having distinct features, a separate history,

---

[5] Smedley(1993) traced the origins and social history of the sociocultural construct of race, focusing particularly on the English in North America and the corresponding development of racial ideology in the United States.

[6] The topic of race cannot be discussed without consideration of the institution of slavery in the history of the United States. While slavery has been a characteristic of many societies throughout history, only in the United States was slave status reserved for black Africans based on their skin color. There exists opposing schools of thought arguing whether slavery fostered racism in U.S. society versus the belief that institutionalism of racism preceded and assisted the development of the system of slavery. Smedley (1993) offers evidence that slavery was a significant factor in the creation and development of racial ideology in the North American colonies.

and a specific sociocultural identity. (p. 30)

It is race, rather than ethnicity, that has shaped political inclusion in the United States. For example, the Naturalization Law of 1790 denied citizenship to non-white immigrants. It was not until the Walter-McCarran Act of 1952 that citizenship could not be denied because of race (see for example, Takaki, 1994). In discussing race, the role of the state is invoked. Omi & Winant (1994, p. 83) refer to "state" as the institutions, their policies, the conditions and rules used to support and justify them, and the overt and covert social relations in which they are embedded. Fagerlind and Saha (1983) offered an additional perspective:

> The State is more than the patterns of political behavior and the recruitment and training of elites in society. The State refers to the power of government, and the characteristics which pertain to the exercise of that power in affecting the other social institutions of society, including the economic, social and political. (p. viii-ix)

Frameworks for Discussing Race Theory

The body of literature on theory of race and ethnicity is voluminous and contradictory. Smedley (1993) wrote, "There are, indeed, few topics in Western intellectual and social history that have been subjected to as much investigation, speculation, analysis, and theoretical scrutiny as the phenomenon of race" (p. 1). Racial worldview shapes and is shaped in a dynamic dialogue between society and its members. Likewise, racial theory is shaped by contemporary race relations. Frameworks to discuss race and ethnicity theory also vary. One way to discuss race theory is to divide theories

of racial and ethnic relations by "order" or "power-conflict" paradigms (Feagin & Feagin, 1996). A more common framework which is utilized in this paper is to create divisions for paradigms under the titles of biology, ethnicity, class, nationalism, and racial formation. This approach allows race theory to be viewed chronologically within U.S. immigration history.

Biological Paradigm

Greene (1981) posits that science is shaped by contemporary knowledge, values, and beliefs. Scientists are subjective and are products of their socio-cultural milieu. Beginning in the eighteenth century, scientists began attempting to prove existence of racial differences and rationale for racism. Prior to that time, religious explanations were the major source of knowledge about the world. Early science concentrated on the description and categorization of natural phenomenon including humans.[7] European whites[8], believed to be the original human form, were the standard against which all others were measured. Eighteenth century scientific race hierarchical orderings, which included the natural inferiority of blacks and Indians, provided rationale for slavery and Indian removal and genocide. Nineteenth century scientific theory informed policy for immigration.

---

[7] Linnaeus in the 1735 (first edition) *Systemae Naturae*, was the first to offer a taxonomic scheme that included humans. Physical features and behavioral/psychological traits were connected. He, like other scientists of his time was influenced by the "Great Chain of Being"; a hierarchical biological paradigm.

[8] Blumenbach, a German medical professor divided humankind into five groups - Caucasian, Mongolian, Ethiopian, American, and Malay. The term "Caucasian" came from the Caucasus region of Russia which he believed had the most beautiful European women. See Slotkin(1965) in Smedley, 1993.

The dawn of the nineteenth century saw the publication of Charles Whites' *An Account of the Regular Gradation in Man* (1799) that held that each race was a separate species (polygeny). This was in opposition to monogenists who believed in the single species theory of humankind. Samuel Morton founded the first school of anthropology based upon the science of craniometry, grounded in the European questionable science of phrenology. Believing brain size was directly related to intelligence, Morton measured skulls and made conclusions on various race's physical, moral and intellectual capacities. From those beginning sprung the field of psychometrics, measuring mental, intellectual, and psychological processes. (Gould, 1981). Anthropometry and somatometry were other instruments in physical anthropology invented for defining and measuring biological differences. Darwin's 1859 publication of *The Origin of Species* heralding the discovery of biological evolution fueled the argument that blacks had not evolved to the same degree as white men and were bound for extinction.

Eugenics was a movement spurred by hereditarian science and implemented with the goal of improving racial stock by selective mating. U.S. social scientists proposed among other things, immigration restrictions for all nationalities except from northern and western European countries, such as the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act[9] (see for example, Reimers, 1985; Takaki, 1989). When Chinese immigration began in the 1850s, the "Yellow Hordes" were seen

[9] The Immigration Act of 1875 was the first legislation pertaining to federal regulation of immigration. It barred prostitutes and convicts from entry into the U.S. Only seven years later the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act followed, barring a particular nationality from entrance. During W.W.II, this statute was repealed as a

as an unassimilatable population similar to Indians and to be treated as such by being denied civil rights and pushed into enclaves. The 1854 California Supreme Court decision of People v. Hall set public policy by ruling that the California statute that Black, Mulatto and Indians were not allowed to testify against whites also applied to Chinese (see for example, Takaki, 1989, p. 102).

Franz Boas was one of the first to begin to question an inherited relationship between physical characteristics and intellectual capacities (see for example, Stocking, 1974). Smedley (1993) writes that Boas and his students were part of a popular reaction to Nazi race ideology at that time. Other factors influencing changes in racial attitudes were two world wars, the Great Depression, extensive demographic changes, growth in education and experiences of Americans, presence of new immigrants, and internal migrations. (p. 273). Boas established the principle of separation between race and language and culture as one of the fundamental tenets of anthropology.

Within the biological paradigm, race as a hegemonic category is rationalized to be a "natural division" (Smedley, p. 142) of humankind. Explanations of why this worldview evolved can range from the psychological ruminations of inferiority and ethnocentrism to economic competition theories. Today, few Americans would explicitly state that physical features are linked to behavioral, intellectual, temperamental and moral qualities.

---

gesture of good will to our Chinese ally. However, a quota system limiting entrance to 105 Chinese per year replaced all out exclusion. This effectively limited Chinese immigration until the 1965 Immigration Act.

Ethnicity Paradigm

Biological social- [pseudo] scientific explanations were challenged by "ethnicity theory" and the idea that race and ethnicity are socially constructed, Inherited cultural characteristics were thought to explain inter/intra group identity formation and relations. Ethnicity theory was interested in minority group incorporation into the host society (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 48).

"Ethnic identity" theory is often classified as "primordialist" versus "instrumentalist". Primordialists treat ethnicity as cultural inheritance or "primordial sentiments" carried over from native country to host country (Geertz, 1962) . It focuses on the maintenance of "tradition". Instrumentalists view ethnic identity as a political and economic resource that can be altered according to contexts of social environment. (Barth, 1969; Cohen, 1981; Portes & Bach, 1985; Bonacich & Modell, 1980). Comaroff (1987) argued that it is the relationship bounding rather than content of the identities that is "primordial".

Assimilation of ethnic groups is believed to be a social process of a newcomer group adapting to the behavior and culture of the host society. The theory is originally attributed to Robert Park and what is now called the Chicago School of Sociology. Park's (1950) race relations cycle involved four stages of contact, conflict or competition, accommodation, and assimilation. It is the basis for the "melting pot" ideology (Sowell, 1981). The model is unilinear. Gordon (1964), added to the idea of assimilation the concept of an imposed "Anglo-conformity" model. His more sophisticated model of assimilation included more

stages than Park's and includes generational considerations. His theory of "ethclasses" envisions an intersection of ethnicity and class.

Cultural Pluralism, a term coined by Horace Kalen (1924), was a belief that each racial or ethnic group has the right to preserve and practice its own cultural heritage (Feagin & Feagin, 1996, p. 502). Wholesale assimilation does not occur. Glazer and Moynihan (1970) examined the negotiating process of white and nonwhite ethnic group identity and across generations within a pluralism model and the resulting communities distinct from each other and their countries of origin. Greeley's (1974) ethnogenesis theory of interaction also suggests negotiation between a host, common and ethnic group culture. Competition Theory (for example, Olzak & Nagel, 1986; Olzak, 1992) holds that ethnic group membership often is affected by niches in the labor force. Ethnic solidarity and accompanying conflict, and collective action comes about through interethnic competition for jobs or housing, political benefits or power.

The ethnicity paradigm is situated within European immigrants' experiences. The assumption was that America offered all racial minorities the identical rights and privileges as white Americans. For European immigrants and descendants, this model has some currency. However, it is not valid for people of color (see Lieberson and Waters, 1988; Takaki 1994). Waters (1990) has explored the voluntary and consciously chosen nature of ethnicity that is the exclusive privilege of white European-descended immigrants and later generations. Smedley (1993) writes that beginning in the late eighteenth century, European-Americans transfigured their ethnic identities (English,

Swedish, Dutch, German) to that of a common "American" group diametrical to groups of color.

Gans (1979) uses the term "symbolic ethnicity" to describe an ethnic identity that is a based on "nostalgic allegiance" to ethnic symbols rather than used instrumentally. Symbols can range from holidays and food to native countries or religious homelands. An example of the former is Saint Patrick's Day and corned beef and cabbage for the Irish. An example of the latter is American Jews' allegiance to Israel. Steinberg (1989) calls Americanized versions of culture "reconstructed ethnicity". The "immigrant analogy" ignores variations in historical experiences . Blauner (1972) notes the common and repressive myth that nonwhite poor today and past ethnic poor share equal opportunities to succeed. Only hard work is needed to succeed[10].

Lee (1994) calls ethnicity a "...pluralist, multidimensional, or multifaceted concept of self...mutually and reciprocally defining - dialog of self and other". According to social anthropology, elements of ethnicity function as symbols within the process of boundary maintenance. These symbols can include language, traditions, and festivals. Ethnic institutions are vehicles for representing this identity to both the ethnic group members and the host society. However, Lowe (1991), Olzak (1985) , and Yancey, Ericksen & Juliani (1976) argue that ethnic culture in the U.S. is partially inherited and partially invented in the process of creating identity markers in ethnic groups in the U.S.

---

[10] In The Ethnic Myth, Steinberg(1989) refuted the myths of what Glazer (1968) has termed early immigrants' "slums of hope" and today's racial minorities' "slums of despair" .

Today, the Asian American group, composed of nationally and culturally distinct communities, is wrestling with being identified as an ethnic entity. Lowe (1991) wrote:

> ...Asian American discussions of ethnicity are far from uniform or consistent; rather, these discussions contain a wide spectrum of articulations that includes, at one end, the desire for an identity represented by a fixed profile of ethnic traits, and at another, challenges to the very notions of identity and singularity which celebrate ethnicity as a fluctuating composition of differences, intersections, and incommensurabilities. These latter efforts attempt to define ethnicity in a matter that accounts not only for cultural inheritance, but for active cultural construction, as well. (p. 27)

The term "Asian American" was coined by members of the 1960s Asian American movement, after rejecting the ethnic label "oriental" ,which means "east"; a colonial term in that Asia is "east" only in relation to Europe (see Browne, 1985; Said, 1978). Society has adopted the homogenizing term to categorize Americans of Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Chinese, Vietnamese, Laotian, Thai and Cambodian and incorporates a current of racism and stereotyped images. At one end of the spectrum is the "model minority" (see Lee, 1991) and on the other end is the "gook" [11]America has fought wars against.

---

[11] Roediger (1992) wrote, In the last 40 years, "gook" has been used chiefly to slur Asian people, but historically, the term has been used to contemptuously identify a number of non-white "enemies" of the United States. Most people do not realize that the term "gook" has a pan-racist past and parallels modern US imperial aggression. The term "goo-goo" was used to describe a Filipino in the Spanish-American War (1899-1902) , more specifically, those with no mix of European blood of that country. It was predicted that this category of inferior humans would die out as progress occurred. During the 1920's United States intervention in Haiti - Marines called the black skinned Haitians "gook". Soldiers in the 1926 invasion of Nicaragua - named the natives likewise. Americans in Costa Rica in the 1930s used the term "goo-goo" to describe the native population. By the Second World War, "gook" was used for the mainly Arab population of North Africa. After the Second World War, even allies of the U.S. were not exempt. Honolulu residents were called "gooks" during the riots between servicemen and the natives of Hawaii. Soldiers in the Korean War borrowed the term again. Because there were no other sustained US interventions between the Korean

The ethnicity school sees race as a noncentral element in U.S. society. Psychological, economic and other forces are seen as the causal forces in racism. Attitudes and prejudices of Americans are the most important factors in racism. It is assumed that European ethnic groups and racial minorities share the same opportunities and position in US society (Blauner, 1972). Critics of the ethnicity paradigm charge homogenizing of historical experiences and ignoring of accompanying hegemonic racial categorization . Assimilation into the host societies language and culture does not guarantee economic and social advancement. Portes & Bach (1985) offered the perspective that conversely, as immigrants and refugees learn their racially legitimated economic position, a development of ethnic consciousness and "resilience of ethnic culture as instruments of political resistance by exploited minorities" (p. 24) occurs. The pluralism position, while advocating for toleration of different cultures, values and beliefs; supports the ideology that races exist.

Class Paradigm

The 1960s black and racial minorities movements (Black, Brown, Red, and Yellow Power) created and were created by class and nationalism theories which contested that ethnicity was the overarching paradigm. Bonacich (1980) theorizes that ethnicity and class intersect and compete as bases of solidarity. In class-based theories racial oppression is tied to the economic processes of material creation and inequality in their allocation.

War and the Vietnam War, the term solidified the modern meaning of "gook" as Asian. The use of a

Class theory is often generalized into two visions of society. Marxian analysis saw society composed of capitalists owning the means of production and proletarians selling their labor power. Weberian analysis saw multiple socialcategories[12]. Market approaches (see for example, Friedman, 1962) looked at market equilibrium. Stratification approaches such as Wilson's (1978) considered distribution dynamics. Class-conflict approaches are centered in the idea of exploitation and class structure based in the "social relations of production" (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 29). Class conflict theory can be further divided into segmentation theory (see for example, Reich, 1982) versus split labor market theories (see for example, Bonacich, 1972, 1980). In class-based theories, racial inequality is not a cause but rather an outcome of market defects, political power structures, or a quest for secure labor control (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 48).

In response to U.S. policies identifying individuals and communities of Asian descent under the racial umbrella term "Asian American", pan-Asian organizations and coalitions were created to advocate for their share of economic and political resources. Espiritu & Ong (1994) posit that class differences within Asian American communities and organizations are the greatest challenge to racial solidarity. Class divisions are said to fragment the population and create a class of "professional social activists" (p. 295) who seek to organize under the racial "Asian American" category around various interests

---

contemptuous term meaning foreigner to identify people in their own country is a hallmark of American racial oppression and war. The term was never used to describe any white non-American, friend or foe.

[12] Bonacich (1980) briefly examines and compares class theories of ethnicity under divisions of "nation-building", "super-exploitation", "split labor market", "middleman minorities" and "national liberation".

such as social service, advocacy, special interests and politics. The result is a membership that clusters around a narrow "professional-managerial class" (p. 303). Class subsumes race as the basis for collective action.

Espiritu & Ong (1994) suggest that a postwar relaxation of racial oppression has both strengthened minority politics and weakened socially constructed bonds of racial solidarity. Class polarization has resulted from the combination of economic access that some sectors of the community have access to[13] and the dichotomous nature of post-1965 Immigration. The Immigration Act of 1965 includes preferences for professionals; lower-class immigrants arriving through family reunification; and those considered as persecuted under the current definition of refugee (see Reimers, 1985).

Espiritu & Ong (1994) argue that interaction with government officials and agencies funding systems requires a level of political sophistication (including proposal writing) which favors the better educated professional and managerial class. Asian American leaders also network within their profession and in multiracial coalitions, reinforcing class linkages (p. 307). They remind that this is not a new phenomenon in either voluntary or formal organizations (see for example, Yinger, 1985; Hein, 1995) and that the Civil Rights movement was initiated by African American professionals.

Class theories explain race within the unequal exchange in the creation and use of economic resources. Racial dynamics are seen as the consequence

[13] Ong & Espiritu suggest Farley & Bianchi (1983) and Wilson (1978, 1987) for a discussion of the emergence of an underclass/privileged class split in the African-American community. An interesting contemporary example is the reaction from some black community leaders to speeches given by Colin Powell and J.C. Watts at the 1996 Republican Convention.

rather than the cause of class identity. Racial membership continues to cut across class membership and in part determines class membership.

Nationalism Paradigm

Nationalist theory has a number of different approaches and considers political disenfranchisement, territorial and institutional segregation and cultural domination among other elements in racism (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 37). However, the foundation in all the varieties of theories is colonialism. Decolonization, a goal of nationalism, is the reversing of power relationships (Fanon, 1963). The "internal colonialism" model (see for example, Carmichael & Hamilton, 1967; Blauner, 1972; Liu, 1976) challenged, but did not gain acceptance across a number of disciplines in the U.S. beginning in the 1960's. Accompanying nationalist theory demands for the restructuring of society included minority-owned organizations and movements , "cultural autonomy" and "national liberation" (Omi & Winant, 1994). In the African American community, Pan-Africanism (see for example, Legum, 1965; Chrisman & Hare, 1974) evolved from a Marxist perspective on racial relations. Afrocentricity (see for example, Asante, 1988) was built on resisting the Eurocentric character of the dominant culture. Cruse (1967, 1968) was instrumental in proposing a cultural nationalism movement; a call to fight cultural domination through unification of collective cultural identity. This included emphasis on the revival of African values, traditions, culture and language. The Chicano Movement also adopted some tenets of cultural nationalism.

Nationalism, like class-based paradigms of race, challenged the ethnicity school's assumption that all migrants follow the path of incorporation taken by white ethnics. Nationalism accedes that racial ideology is what legitimizes repression by the colonizers towards maintaining the status quo. While nation-based theory reminds us to take historical context to a global level, the consideration of racial oppression is still an outcome of national oppression or colonialism.

Nationalism was one current in the Asian American Movement that began in the 1960s. Omatsu (1994) chronicled Asian American activism using such terms as "struggles for liberation". He wrote:

> ...the birth of the Asian American Movement coincided not with the initial campaign for civil rights but with the later demand for black liberation; that the leading influence was not Martin Luther King, Jr., but Malcolm X; that the focus of a generation of Asian American activists was not on asserting racial pride but reclaiming a tradition of militant struggle by earlier generations; that the movement was not centered on the aura of racial identity but embraced fundamental questions of oppression and power; that the movement consisted of not only college students but large numbers of community forces, including the elderly, workers, and high school youth; and that the main thrust was not one of seeking legitimacy and representation within American society but the larger goal of liberation. (p. 21)

Racial Formation Theory

Ethnicity theory, under the control of neoconservatives has reemerged in the late 1970s until present. However, it has been challenged by the emergence of racial formation theory that positions race as the "fundamental axis of social organization in the U.S." (Omi & Winant, 1994). San Juan (1992)

held the position "...that race, not ethnicity, is the explanatory and hermeneutic concept needed to describe the heterogeneous terrain of conflicting cultures in the United States" (p. 5). Her critique of ethnicity theory continued:

> Race, not ethnicity, articulates with class and gender to generate the effects of power in all its multiple protean forms. Ethnicity theory elides power relations, conjuring an illusory state of parity among bargaining agents. It serves chiefly to underwrite a functionalist mode of sanctioning a given social order. It tends to legitimize a pluralist but hierarchical status quo. (p. 5)

In the past, a racial dictatorship defined "American" as white; Pequot, Iroquois and Tutelo as "Native"; and Asante, Ovimbundu, Yoruba and Bakongo as "Black". Today it is a racial hegemony that has defined Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Cambodian, Filipino as "Asian". Today there are political incentives offered in return for accepting these categorizations that were not there for the conquested Pequots and Asantes. Since the 1960s, race has become a means of claiming resource distribution in areas such as housing, employment and education.

Omi & Winant (1994) argued that existing theories of racial dynamics subsume race under ethnicity, class and nationalism in explaining racial tensions and oppression. Additionally, they ignore the state's role in organizing

and enforcing U.S. racial order. Rather than follow this line of reductionism[14], Omi & Winant examined the dialectical processes of how groups become racially identified, and how that identity fluctuates over time, and how racial conflicts impact American politics and society. They define race as "...a concept which signifies and symbolizes social conflicts and interests by referring to different types of human bodies" (p. 55). Racial formation is defined as "...the sociohistorical process by which racial categories are created, inhabited, transformed, and destroyed" (p. 55). The process of racial formation is the creation of racial projects, defined as "...simultaneously an interpretation, representation, or explanation of racial dynamics, and an effort to reorganize and redistribute resources along particular racial lines" (p. 56). Racial formation is inextricably intertwined with the hegemonic[15] order of a particular society. Coercion and consent are both involved in consolidating the authority of a ruling group. A society's "common sense" is defined and disseminated through educational, popular and religious channels. Omi & Winant (1994) wrote, "The dominant racial theory provides society with "common sense" about race and with categories for the identification of individuals and groups in racial terms" (p. 11).

---

[14] Omi & Winant (1994) recognize the nonpolar continuity of and between these schools of thought and their contributions to the consideration of racial dynamics. However, they insist that what is missing is the addressing of "...a unitary social and historical problematic - that of race in the U.S." (p. 49).

[15] Hall (1986) suggests that although he did not write explicitly about race and ethnicity, Gramsci's work is useful in a non-reductive "complexifying existing theories and problems" and emphasizing historical specificity (p. 5). Omi & Winant (1994), San Juan (1992) and Lowe (1991), for example, all use Gramscian concepts such as "hegemony", "war of maneuver" Vs "war of position"," traditional intellectual" versus "organic intellectual" and "common sense" versus "good sense" within their critical race theory. For introductions to Gramscian philosophy and terminology see for example, Gramsci (1971), Forgacs(1988) & Armstrong (1988).

The racially based political mobilization of the 1960s instigated equity-based reform and opened up the political process to racial minority group members. The 1970s and 1980s witnessed emerging neoconservative political demagoguery, fueling a backlash[16] of European descended Americans resentments in a context of domestic economic challenges. Racial minorities, including refugees and immigrants, were alleged to have received special treatment [17] and benefits. The far right, new right, neoconservatives and neoliberals have attempted, with varying degrees of subtlety, to "rearticulate" or redefine racial ideology. Both neoconservatives and neoliberals trump the fairness of a color-blind society (universalism) over racial group organization and resource allotment. In the 1990s, liberal social welfare policies created in the 1960s are scapegoated as the cause of a supposed lack of personal responsibility and a fostered dependency on public assistance in communities of color. The "fix the victim" mentality strengthens the existing hegemony and the accompanying non-critical consent of society rather than working toward institutional equality.

The headline making neoliberal hegemonic racial project at the time of this writing (Summer 1996, election year) is the passage of a welfare reform act entitled "The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act" signed into law by President Clinton on August 22, 1996. Rising anti-immigrant sentiment and

---

[16] Takaki (1994) and others consider Allan Bakke's suit against the University of California charging affirmative action was "reverse discrimination" both a symbol and a precedent of white backlash reaction in the 1970s.

[17] Compare the language used in discussing anti-immigrant sentiment and racial politics. Omi & Winant (1994) offered the term "social meanness" (p. 113); while Senator Alan K. Simpson employed the term "compassion fatigue" (in Zucker & Zucker, 1987, p.86).

racial scapegoating of particular minorities for U.S. cultural and economic decline has articulated itself in the "Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996". This law includes provisions to reduce illegal immigration and reduce access of legal immigrants to public assistance and resources (Migration News, October 1996). In education, there continues a school reform movement that includes a war against bilingual education and multicultural education (see for example, Apple, 1993, 1995; Macedo, 1994; Walsh, 1996; Giroux & Aronowitz, 1995; Giroux & McLauren 1989; McCarthy, 1990, 1993; Shor, 1986). The Supreme Court is currently deciding on the constitutionality of English-only legislation. Battles against anti-affirmative action measures also continue.[18]

The effects of using a racial categorization of Asian American have ranged from exclusion acts and quotas[19] to more recent university quotas (see for example, Takagi, 1992; Woo, 1988; Wang, 1989). The "model minority" discourse emerged in the 1960s era of racial upheaval with articles praising Japanese and Chinese Americans' self-sufficient success in entering mainstream American life and overcoming racial discrimination. The 1980s saw a shift in focus towards successes of Koreans and Indochinese. Traditional Asian cultural values such as respect for family, authority, learning, thrift and hard work were seen as responsible for subsequent achievement in education

[18] Higham (1955), Dinnerstein & Reimers (1975), Zucker & Zucker (1987) and others have discussed the nativism and accompanying legislative restrictions on the civil rights of immigrants during the first half of this century. This period foreshadowed the 1990s racist restrictionism legitimized by the U.S. government.
[19] See Chan, 1991 for a review of U.S. immigration legislation and the political, economic, military and social relationships between Asian countries and the U.S. influencing Asian immigration and refugee movement.

and occupations (Lee, 1991). This new stereotype was rearticulated[20] by the conservative political demagogues and offered as proof that America was a meritocratic, as opposed to racial society. The failure of other minority groups, especially Black Americans, to achieve socioeconomically is attributed to negative cultural traits including poor work ethic and a nonemphasis on family. (Osajima, 1988). The continued stereotypical image of model minority has been one factor in the discriminatory backlash that has increased towards Asian Americans in the 1980s and 1990s.

Lowe considered heterogeneity, hybridity, and multiplicity of the Asian American experience and identity as tools for deconstructing the dominant/ minority hegemonic relationship. This would be accomplished through "a strategy to destabilize the dominant discursive construction and determination of Asian Americans as a homogeneous group" and "to contribute to a dialogue within Asian American discourse, to negotiate with those modes of argumentation that continue to uphold a politics based on "ethnic identity" (p. 28).

Racial formation theory allows the analysis of the intersection of race, social, political, economic structure and power. Furthermore, racial formation theory explains why social scientists offered biological, ethnic, class and nationalism explanations of race at different junctures in U.S. history. It allows for historical flexibility that accompanies racial identity formation.

---

[20] Rearticulation, a concept elaborated by Omi & Winant (1994) "is the process of redefinition of political interests and identities, through a process of recombination of familiar ideas and values in hitherto unrecognized ways" (p. 163).

Definitions for Discussing Refugees and Immigrants

U.S. acceptance and reception of international migrants is regulated by state immigration legislation. Both U.S. government policy and social science literature have observed and made decisions based on definitions of refugees and immigrants. Zucker & Zucker (1987) wrote:

> The words matter. Whether one is called a refugee or a special entrant, an applicant for asylum or an illegal alien - in short, what status one is given by the receiving country - determines not only one's right to remain, but also a wide range of rights and entitlements, from the right to citizenship, through legal rights, to the rights to be employed and to receive federal assistance. (p. xiv)

United States immigration law did not distinguish between a refugee and an immigrant until after World War II[21]. From the end of World War II to 1980, the United States considered as a refugee only those coming from communist countries or the Middle East[22] . The 1980 Refugee Act (P.L. 96-212) adopted the internationally accepted 1951 United Nation definition of a refugee. According to Section 101 (a) (42), a refugee is:

> any person who is outside any country of such person's nationality or, in the case of a person having no nationality, is outside any country in which such a person last habitually resided, and who is unable or unwilling to avail himself or herself of the protection of, that country because of persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion.

---

[21] See Dinnerstein (1982) for the history of the Displaced Person Act of 1948, the first refugee legislation in the United States.

[22] Zucker & Zucker (1987, p. 86) argued that even after the 1980 Refugee Act, refugees most likely to be admitted to the U.S. still come primarily from Communist countries.

The Federal Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 defined an alien as a person who is not a citizen or national of the United States. Two classes are divided into immigrants, aliens who have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence; and non-immigrants, or aliens who have been admitted for a temporary stay for a specific purpose. In addition there are a number of transitional legal aliens as well as "illegal" aliens who could be undocumented or overstayed their non-immigrant visas. Rights, benefits, and liabilities are awarded according to the legal classification of refugees and immigrants.[23] (Massachusetts Office for Refugees and Immigrants, 1990).

Hein (1993b) differentiated between nominalist and realist perspectives defining the social construction of categories called "immigrant" and "refugee". The realist perspective is exemplified in Kunz's (1973) "refugee in flight" theory which holds that refugees are "pushed" out because of fear of persecution. Immigrants, conversely, are "pulled" out by mostly economic incentives. Kunz also divides refugee movement into two kinetic types: anticipatory and acute. Nominalist perspective posits that the main difference between refugees and immigrants is how they are defined and their relationship with the state during the process of uprooting, migration and adaptation (Hein, 1993b).

State intervention shapes refugees and immigrants incorporation into the host society in different ways. State control of both international migration and social welfare emerged in the early part of the twentieth century. The U.S.

---

[23] In the U.S., refugees are eligible to become "permanent residents" after one year of residence. This status has provided access to the social welfare system and protected against deportation. Previously benefits of naturalization were primarily sponsoring priority, voting and eligibility for some government jobs.

government has linked international migration and the welfare state through refugee policy.

Immigration Legislation and State Incorporation[24] of Indochinese Refugees

Restrictionism as a national ethos has influenced U.S. immigration legislation. Zucker and Zucker (1987) listed the three strategies employed in the history of American immigration: (a) curtailment of immigration, such as the exclusion of specific groups or immigration suspension proposals; (b) barriers to immigration, such as literacy or economic self-sufficiency tests; (c) strict regulation of numbers and types of immigrants permitted entry, such as quotas or deportation provisions (p. 3).

The examination of refugee incorporation into U.S. society is different from that of immigrants in that the category of refugee is, "a political status, validated by an explicit decision of the U.S. government" (Portes & Rumbaut, 1990; p. 26). Zucker and Zucker (1987, 1989) analyzed the political nature of American refugee admission policy as a competitive coalition of foreign policy, interest groups, and resettlement costs. Of refugee policy, Zucker & Zucker (1987) wrote:

> Knowing why refugees are admitted will inevitably reveal who will be admitted. For refugee policy does not in fact serve refugees; rather, it designates as refugees those who serve the policy. (p. xvi)

The 1996 Immigration Reform Law includes provisions to tie access to social welfare to full citizenship status.

[24] Hein (1991) defined state incorporation as "...the use of social welfare programs to promote the adaptation of select groups of émigrés" (p. 157).

There are three options in refugee policy - repatriation, integration into first asylum countries, and third country resettlement. Resettlement is the least utilized solution with the exception of Indochinese (Stein, 1986; Hein, 1993b). The admission and resettlement of Indochinese refugees has been unique in U.S. immigration history. Indochinese refugees arrived in the United States as "allied aliens". Whereas enemy aliens are government branded disloyal citizens such as Japanese Americans interned during World War II, allied aliens are "foreigners to whom a state extends protection because of their voluntary or coerced allegiance to the state's foreign policy objectives" (Hein, 1993a, p.2-3).

Hein (1993a) wrote that in the United States, three historical factors have shaped the state's unique incorporation of Indochinese refugees. The first factor is that only the Indochinese migration is a result of a failed military intervention[25]. Their migration is a direct result of U.S. interventionist foreign policy defeats. As opposed to prior situations with communist countries where the U.S. encouraged refugee movement to drain an enemy's middle class professional base or tarnish its image (the people 'vote with their feet'), Indochinese admissions were originally seen as obligations and "rescue operations" (Loescher and Scanlon, 1986 in Hein, 1993a) with little strategic political value.

The second factor is that Vietnamese, Laotian and Cambodian communities did not exist before 1975. Indochinese refugees did not have existing ethnic enclaves and mutual aid organizations to assist them when they

[25] Prior military linked migration to the U.S. from Asia includes Filipinos and Koreans (see Chan, 1991).

arrived in the U.S. Hein (1993a) wrote, "The absence of Indochinese communities in the U.S. prior to 1975 augmented the refugees' status as allied aliens because there was no ethnic identity to balance their political identity" (p. 30). An oft quoted statistic is that in 1964, there were only 603 Vietnamese living in the U.S. ; mostly students, language teachers and diplomats (Takaki, 1990) . Taft et. al. (1980) offered the 1975 figures of 13,747 Indochinese immigrants and 4,342 Vietnamese-American citizens in the U.S. Most of this number was comprised of wives of American servicemen.

The third factor is that the Indochinese refugees arrived at the same time as large numbers of immigrants, undocumented aliens, and other refugees during a time of a downturn in the domestic economy and a decline in the U.S. economic and political global hegemony. The 1965 Immigration Act had changed the composition and color of U.S. immigration and had been met by a restrictionist backlash fueled by federal government attempts to reclaim ground lost during the Civil Rights Movement. Hein (1993a) theorized that it was nativism and anti-foreign attitudes combined with historical amnesia, rather than negative association between the refugees and the Vietnam War that created negative public opinion and restrictionist attitudes. Hein (1993a) wrote, "Nativism erodes the allied alien status of the refugees just as attitudes toward public aid reduce the refugees' political symbolism" (p. 63).

Hein (1993a) offered evidence that refugee managers are influenced by the model minority stereotype in working in Indochinese resettlement. However, he also stated that the model for Indochinese incorporation is based

on the idealized European immigrant experience. Hein (1993a) wrote that refugee managers have based their policies on ethnicity retaining strategies rather than assimilation. He wrote that there are diametrical aims of the nation-state and the welfare state in dual policies of dispersing[26] refugees and funding ethnic self-help associations:

> At the local level, government officials and staff in nonprofit organizations encourage refugees to congregate and build ethnic institutions, believing that these practices were prerequisites for successful adaptation among European immigrants. However, at the national level a dispersal policy prevents new arrivals from settling in areas where large numbers of Indochinese already live. Concern that the refugees will prove costly to public aid bureaus leads refugee managers to sacrifice traditions in the American nation-state to meet the interests of the welfare state." (p. 64)

Zucker & Zucker (1987) wrote, "When a refugee enters the United States, a new set of policy questions surrounds him - questions of resettlement. Outside the border, policy questions asked who; within the border, policy questions ask how and where" (p. 97). Wells C. Klein, Executive Director of the American Council for Nationalities Service has called refugee resettlement "social engineering" (in Zucker & Zucker, 1987, p. 131). Refugee legislation[27] has both established and institutionalized procedures for providing social

---

[26] Secondary migration and refugees social networks have proved stronger than federal dispersal policies. See for example, Desbarats (1985).

[27] The Indochina Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1975 (U.S. SL 1975) provided for one-time funding for Indochinese refugees. States would be reimbursed by the federal government for cash and medical assistance. The Reauthorization Act in 1977 (U.S. SL 1977) continued federal funding and offered refugees the status of "permanent resident". The Indochinese Refugee Children Assistance Act of 1976 (U.S. SL 1976) reimbursed states for refugee children's education, including language instruction and also funded adult refugee education programs. The Refugee Act of 1980 (P.L. 96-212) institutionalized federal assistance by, among other agreements, established the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) in the Department of Health and Human Services. See Leibowitz (1983) and Kennedy (1981) for legislative history, goals and examples of implementation of Refugee Act of 1980. See Strand & Jones (1985) for effects on resettlement policies. See Gallagher, Forbes & Fagen (1985) for the independent Refugee Policy Group's analysis of the Refugee Act.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

services including language and job training/ placement/ counseling programs, professional retraining and recertification, special educational projects for refugee children in schools and less restrictive public aid eligibility criteria unique from those of other immigrants and American born citizens. The 1980 Refugee Act married the welfare state and refugee resettlement by institutionalizing "...comprehensive and uniform provisions for the effective resettlement and absorption of those refugees who are admitted" [Section 101(b)].

National and State government have quarreled over the federal responsibility to fund refugee programs. Nativism and its resulting local/State negative reception of Indochinese refugees has forced the central government to centralize aid and resources to this population. This is in opposition to the federalist system in the U.S. which traditionally divides social welfare policy and program management between central, state and local government (Hein, 1993a).

Voluntary agencies (VOLAGS) which once aided arriving refugees with little or no federal funding began to receive reimbursement for resettling Indochinese refugees beginning in 1975[28]. VOLAGS share the goal of refugee resettlement leading to economic self-sufficiency and cultural adjustment; but vary in their affiliations, philosophies, procedures, clientele and structure. The

---

[28] The majority of government and private monies allotted for refugees support national resettlement voluntary agencies (VOLAGS), state public assistance programs and other service providers. The Center for Applied Linguistics 1994 publication of A Guide to Resettlement in the United States lists twelve U.S. voluntary agencies. The annual Refugee Resettlement Program - Report to Congress includes resettlement agency reports. See for example, Wright, 1981 & Strand & Jones;1985 for policy and structure of refugee resettlement. See Haines (1985) for brief overview of U.S. resettlement effort. See Caplan, et

American Council for Voluntary International Action (InterAction) is the umbrella organizations of the VOLAGS. Hein (1993c) contends there are two different kinds of American voluntary agencies and each accords refugees with a "master status" that affects the refugees initial adaptation to American society. Migration-oriented agencies identify refugees as international migrants from the Third World. Welfare-oriented agencies identify refugees as welfare recipients.

DeVoe (1981) theorized that the refugee master status blinds helpers to the refugee's history, goals, and cultural orientations including self help behavior. Refugee's social networks are assisted by nation-state support of ethnic communities. These networks share survival strategies including the use of public assistance. The welfare state sees refugees as individuals or households and attempts to minimize access to welfare (Hein, 1993a)[29]. Conflict is inevitable.

The refugee's status in the social welfare system is the distinguishing characteristic in examining refugee and immigrant adaptation. Hein (1993a) stated:

> To a great extent, the adaptation of international migrants is determined by class background, gender, and labor market conditions. Yet the adaptation process also is shaped by migrants' relationship to the host state, particularly the historical context of the migration, the organization of the welfare system, and the prevailing pattern of race and ethnic relations. (p. 164)

---

al(1985) for a study on the effectiveness of the refugee resettlement program and central predictors of "self-sufficiency".

[29] Rates of public assistance increased in the 1980s. The existence of a benefits folklore is one factor. A far more important factor is that later arrivals had less education and transferable job skills than earlier arrivals. The U.S. uses public resource consumption to measure newcomer "progress".

Citizenship is both a matter of nationality and access to the social welfare system. Indochinese refugees have a unique form of social citizenship by being accorded special status in the social welfare system (Hein, 1993a,b).

Conclusion

Race as a worldview is now believed to be a sociocultural phenomenon that is only a few hundred years old. Today the United States continues to function within an ideology of fundamental differences and inequality determined along racial lines. It continues as the hegemonic tool of offering and denying access to economic and educational opportunities as well as respect and validation for cultural traditions. There are a number of race-based societies throughout the world. The race system in the U.S. is unique in it's rigidly bounded dichotomous black and white castes. Asian immigrants and refugees do not fit neatly into this classification system.

European Americans and African Americans have different histories of incorporation. The idealized immigrant legacy involves voluntary migration, growth of ethnic communities and eventual assimilation and mobility. The African-American experience is one of forced migration and denial of rights and resources and the opportunity for assimilation and mobility. Previously Asian Americans arrived voluntarily as immigrants, yet because of skin color, are subjected to racist exploitation and denial of full civil rights. However, in overcoming barriers to educational access, many Asians have been able to achieve economic upward mobility. This achievement has been the basis of the

"model minority" stereotype. The creation of the Asian American category is an example of what Omi & Winant (1994) term a "racial project".

Indochinese refugees are appended to the established model minority Asian American population because they are of Asian ancestry. Indochinese refugees are also paradoxically seen as part of the vilified illegal alien influx. They are a nonwhite population from Third World nations. They are stigmatized as having unfair access and high usage of public assistance. Additionally, many Americans cannot differentiate between refugees and immigrants, legal and illegal immigrants. Anti-welfare attitudes and corresponding legislation have also contributed to the override of the original "allied alien" identity.

Concepts of "race", "immigrant", and "refugee" can be considered social constructions created in dialogue between society and individual. No one paradigm explains refugee/immigrant formation of individual or group identity, inter and intra group relations or group mobilization. However, a racial formation theory posits that class, gender, ethnicity are all fundamentally negotiated through racial formation. Additionally, racial formation can provide a lens for examining U.S. immigration and refugee policy. The nativist and restrictionist immigration legislation that determines status and resultant resettlement assistance or lack of it, is another racial project. The resultant state intervention influences immigrant/refugee identity formation and incorporation into the host society. This incorporation determines rights and access. It also determines shape and organization of refugee/immigrant group organization and collective action. It is within a racial political lens that the effects of racial

and political identity on community organization within Asian American communities and Indochinese communities will be examined in Paper Two.

PAPER II

COLLECTIVE ORGANIZATION AND ACTION AROUND RACIAL IDENTITY

Immigrants and refugees migrating to the United States have historically created communities based on race, religion, language, cultural heritage and special interests. Yancey, Ericksen, & Juliani (1976) argued that forms of ethnicity, including the development of ethnic organizations, are situational responses to survival and opportunity needs. Conditions of occupation, residential stability and segregation and institutional affiliation interact in ethnic identity and group organization development (p. 399).

Rather than translate cultural heritage, newcomers invent unique forms of both ethnic identity and organization in their host societies. Internal factors affecting this process include diverse native country origins and factional antagonism. External factors include the racial dynamics of the host country and the accompanying racial politics and policy that shape the social structure within which the newcomers operate and the organization of self-help initiatives. Early Asian immigrants developed ethnic organizations utilizing traditional forms of leadership structure. The social welfare state in the U.S. has been developing and affecting immigrant/refugee communities since the early 1900s. In the U.S. today, state incorporation involves a conflict between the western welfare state and the indigenous forms of self-help that Indochinese refugees bring from their native countries.

In the United States, Indochinese refugees have their ethnic community organization and social citizenship orchestrated by refugee policy. Additionally, Indochinese refugees, though categorized as "Asian Americans", an existing racial category, have generally neither internalized this identity nor participate widely in pan-Asian organizations.

Questions to be addressed include:

1. What have been the consequences of racial formation for community organization and collective action in immigrant Asian American communities?

2. What have been the consequences of state managed social citizenship for Indochinese refugee community organization and collective action?

3. What is the intersection between immigrant and refugee experiences?

4. What are the implications for refugee education?

This paper will examine historical and contemporary examples of collective organization around racial identity within Asian American communities and Indochinese refugee communities. The challenges of heterogeneity within an Asian American classification will be discussed. Distinctions and similarities between immigrant and refugee organization will also be explored. The main focus is on the external conditions that shape how immigrants and refugees organize self-help initiatives. Implications for refugee community education will be discussed in the conclusion.

Types of Immigrant/Refugee Organizations and Collective Actions

Smedley (1993) offered:

> Values, attitudes, and beliefs are cultural traits and are nongenetic; they are extrasomatic, learned and transmitted through enculturation processes. Individuals and groups can and do change their ethnic or cultural identities and interests through such processes as migration, conversion, and assimilation or through exposure to modifying influences. (p. 31)

Movements of various social and ethnic groups create a collective identity by redefining members' views of themselves and views of the government and the ideologies that have created these identities . This is the process of rearticulation (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 99). Where before the 1960s, racial groups often operated along individual survival lines, The modern Civil Rights Movement and racially based minority movements were ones of collective opposition. Out of the Asian American Movement came formal as well as grassroots "serve the people" organizations and student organizations, Asian American departments and classes in universities, and pan-Asian organizations.[30]

Lee (1994) examined boundary making strategies various Asian American communities utilized and found that each community maintained different internally meaningful cultural boundaries, variations in identity making and political mobilization across the boundaries. Hein (1993a) considered the effects of the relationship between migrants and the host society on ethnic community development:

---

[30] For some historical overviews of the Asian American Movement see for example, Wei (1993). For coverage of contemporary Asian American political activity, see Aguilar-San Juan (1994). Chan (1991)&

> Where the welfare state determines the type of social citizens international migrants become, the nation-state patterns their formation of ethnic communities. Nationality and the naturalization process may have once been the core of the western nation-state. Race and ethnic relations are more significant for the adaptation of contemporary immigrants. Yet the nation-state's interest in managing cultural pluralism is not isolated from the economic and fiscal interests of the welfare state. Whether migrants retain their mother tongue or rapidly learn the new language, whether they live with or far from compatriots, are issues that compete for the state's attention with the migrants' labor market performance and use of public assistance. (p. 64)

Single immigrant/refugee group communities still exist and continue to be created. However, this form of organization has been joined by mutual assistance organizations, pan-ethnic organizations and multi-ethnic organizations.

Ethnic Enclaves

Omi & Winant (1994) used a Gramscian distinction between "war of position", which is represented by the previously mentioned Asian American Movement; and "war of maneuver", which is represented in the formation of ethnic enclaves. Enclaves were formed when slaves, American Indians, Asians and other minorities, being banned from the political system, moved physically and politically outward to homogeneous communities. The inward focus was on individuals, families and communities for economic and cultural/spiritual support (Omi & Winant, 1994; p. 80-81). An example of ethnic enclaves in the

---

Takaki (1989) offers a comparative history of Asian-Americans that includes context of immigration, social organization and political resistance initiatives.

history of Asian Americans is the creation of relatively self-sufficient and protective Chinatowns (Kwong, 1987), Japantowns and Manilatowns.

Portes & Manning (1986) wrote that ethnic enclaves are formed as a result of unequal economic position and resultant challenges to assimilation. Immigrants have been transformed "...either to hopeless communities of "unmeltable" ethnics or to militant minorities, conscious of a common identity and willing to support a collective strategy of self-defense rather than relying on individual assimilation" (p. 49). Enclaves are also cultural repositories of how life in their native country is (see for example, Woldemikael, 1987) or was before political or social upheavals and transformation (see for example, Farber, 1987).

Espiritu (1989) proposed that experiences in the home country, specifically, membership in either the majority population or an ethnic minority group is an additional factor to be considered in ethnic mobilization. The former she terms "first-time minorities", the latter "twice minorities". In the host country, societal designations produce "categoric ethnic groups The acceptance by the newcomer of the label creates a level of shared interest, however, it does not necessarily solidify it. A solidary ethnic group is created when there is an eternal threat and assimilation is not an option due to skin color. The group attempts to overcome identity differences and concentrate on an ethnic identification a rallying point for collective action that reflects this ethnic identification. One form of action is the formation of ethnic communities and organizations.

While an enclave can describe a geographic concentration, it sometimes also denotes an economic zone. Ethnic enclaves have been studied for their economic benefits they provide to residents . [31] Portes & Manning (1986) offer the characteristics of an ethnic enclave, "The emergence of an ethnic enclave economy has three prerequisites: first, the presence of a substantial number of immigrants, with business experience acquired in the sending country; second, the availability of sources of capital; and third, the availability of sources of labor" (p. 61).

Ethnic enclaves are shaped by both political situations in native country and host country. Immigration policies managing immigration flows and factors such as social welfare policy affect political and economic adaptation. Immigrant/refugee policy has shaped both the newcomer profile and the reception they receive in the U.S. Gold (1992) and others hold that forms of discrimination against recent refugees and immigrants are quantitatively less severe compared to those that affected earlier immigrants (p. 19). The well educated immigrants who have entered the U.S. since the Immigration Act of 1965, who have experienced fewer economic mobility barriers, have tended not to join or form ethnic enclaves.

---

[31] For documentation of historical and contemporary immigrant and refugee enclaves and economic based solidarity , see for example, Light (1972) comparing Chinese, Japanese and black communities; Bonacich & Modell(1980) on Japanese communities; Kim (1981) on Korean communities; and Portes & Bach (1985) on the Cuban community.

Ethnic Community Organizations

Immigrants and refugees have historically formed self-help associations based on native country ties such as locality, language, religion or kinship; or special interest political or economic groups. American Chinatowns, for example, had district associations called *huiguan* , clan associations and rotating credit associations. Chan (1991) wrote:

> Associations formed by Asian immigrants, like those created by immigrants of other origins, provided mutual aid to their members and served as settings where co-ethnics could partake of warmth and conviviality. At the same time, they functioned as instruments of social control over the masses of immigrants and as legitimizers of the status accorded particular immigrant leaders. The latter exercised power and acquired prestige not only by virtue of being officers of community organizations but also by serving as communication links - and consequently, as power brokers - between their compatriots and the external world. (p. 63)

The structure of community self-help associations was based on organizational structures in the home country. Leaders and qualifications for leadership were also transferred. Associations and migration networks through district or kinship were intimately connected. However, the structure of immigrant/ refugee legislation which preferences skilled, family members of immigrants and refugees in America and newcomer refugees has changed the structure of migration. Chain migration and networks including leadership structure, which are characteristic of prior immigrant migration, are replaced by geographically and socially mixed migration (Gold, 1992; Light & Bhachu,

1990; Massey et al, 1987; Okamura, 1983).[32] For refugees, welfare eligibility, English classes, job training and placement benefits also may hinder community organization. These services allow many newcomers to avoid ethnic labor markets. Previous immigrant groups were provided these services by private ethnic or voluntary organizations. This in turn hinders co-ethnic dependence and community formation (Gold, 1992).

The immigrant and refugee populations who have arrived post-1965 have been extremely heterogeneous in education and professional skills as well as age levels. Zucker & Zucker (1987, p. 100) suggested a subdivision of refugees into "waves" and "vintages". Waves indicate the time of refugees arrival to the host country. Vintages refer to the time and circumstances of departure from the native country. There is usually time spent in asylum countries and processing facilities that separate time of departure from the native country and time of arrival in the host country. Stein (1981; in Zucker & Zucker, 1987) uses the term "public title" to describe the homogeneous classifications assigned to refugee groups by Americans. Differences in culture, language, religion, education, political system, economics, subsistence patterns and even nation are ignored. Like immigrants before them, rather than instant solidarity, recently arrived newcomer groups are factionalized by ideology, religion, ethnicity, geographic region, class and occupation, and

[32] There is evidence that both Indochinese (Institute Asian Studies, 1988) and Cuban refugees (Portes & Bach 1985) have also been found to use kin and friendship networks in migration.

conditions of migration and settlement (Gold, 1992; Nguyen & Henkin, 1984; Skinner, 1980).[33]

Adaptation process and outcomes also vary within groups. The Indochinese migration was composed of earlier arrival with higher levels of education and transferable job skills and later arrivals with less education and transferable job skills. Attitudes of distrust and resentment as well as pride are variously exhibited in recent arrivals toward their earlier arriving elite-classed countrymen.

Community organization has tended to organize around exclusive interest groups[34] within one of the above identities rather than throughout the entire population . (see Gold, 1992; Breton, 1964; Finnan and Cooperstein, 1983; Kim 1981; Nguyen & Henkin, 1984). Researchers including Gold (1988, 1992); Kim (1981); and Finnan & Cooperstein (1983) have noted a "too many leaders, too few followers syndrome". Family /friend networks often are the mainstay of social and economic bonds and aid even when ethnic organizations, agencies and public programs are available. (Kibria, 1993; Gold, 1992; Finnan & Cooperstein, 1983; Caplan et al. 1985; Hirayama & Hirayama, 1988).

---

[33] Conversely, downward occupational mobility, paternalistic resettlement systems, shared political concerns, and psychological distress caused by the refugee experience can be strong motivating factors in the creation of ethnic solidarity and the formation of ethnic enclaves and organizations. See Light (1980) for a discussion on "reactive solidarity".

[34] Examples of special constituency groups include women's, senior citizen, fraternal, veterans, alumni and professional groups.

Mutual Assistance Associations (MAAs)

Whereas past immigrant communities in the U.S. had self-supporting self-help organizations and many still function today, refugee newcomers have been beneficiaries to government funding for developing Mutual Assistance Associations (MAAs). In the most general terms, MAAs are private, nonprofit organizations managed and operated by refugees. Some common goals of MAAs include promoting mutual understanding and friendship between refugees and Americans; assisting refugees in employment placement and receiving public assistance benefits; providing English classes and other tutorial programs; acting as clearinghouses for community news; encouraging preservation of native culture in the host society; and assisting in family reunification (Rutledge, 1992).

MAAs vary in size, organizational maturity and effectiveness (Zucker & Zucker, 1987). Mortland (1993) reviewed the development of Southeast Asian refugee self-help groups in the U.S. Le & Bui (1981) discussed roles and responsibilities of Indochinese MAAs. Formally organized Southeast Asian groups, for example, started appearing after 1975. MAAs can be categorized into six major types, based on their service focus: (a) cultural preservation/social activities; (b) religious services; (c) special constituency groups; (d) resettlement/social services; (e) business and economic development; (f) advocacy and political action (Indochina Resource Action Center, 1988).

Since 1980, these groups have received funding and recognition from the Office of Refugee Resettlement by adjusting their organizational structures, goals and activities to American policy and procedures (p. 15). The U.S. government saw the possibility for sharing responsibilities for providing social services between the national voluntary agencies (VOLAGS) and social service agencies and the new MAAs. Both the refugees and Americans had the idea that social services could be provided more effectively and in more culturally and linguistically appropriate ways by refugee organizations. Jenkins (1988) has explored how immigration and social welfare policies influence self-help organization and how ethnic associations are now fulfilling a number of social service functions. Some groups remain focused on their original agendas as they add on social services. Others change their overt agendas to providing social services, while keeping their original agendas covertly. Organizations also have been set up[35] after the realization of the possibility of funding.

The absence of pre-1975 Indochinese communities was seen by refugee policy makers as a challenge to refugees' incorporation and therefore created programs to develop refugee communities, including sponsoring MAAs. State sponsored MAAs become the dominant associations in refugee communities and have sometimes been criticized as working toward the goals of the state rather than the community. This causes internal conflicts with other cultural , special interest, political and economic associations and indigenous leaders within the refugee community.

---

[35] Some organizations have been established with the help of or the instigation of Americans with varying

Zucker & Zucker (1987) have listed benefits and liabilities of using MAAs as part of the resettlement system. Benefits include more readily available services to hard-to-reach groups such as older refugees; and some voice from the communities, through MAA leaders, in resettlement issues concerning them. Liabilities have included tension between MAAs and service providers in competition over funding and the use of MAAs as tools in community leadership power struggles.

MAAs vary in the range of services they provide and the approaches used. Mortland (1993) writes that most funders and other social service organizations believe (or ignore the myth) that the social service models in MAAs are based on an American model of social service provision when actually they are operating on a different conceptual model (p.17). The United States and other industrialized, bureaucratic societies function under a provider-client model that stresses access directly and on an individual basis. In Southeast Asia, resource and service distribution works on a group system (immediate family, extended family, village (Mortland suggests for example, Keyes, 1977) and a patronage system (Mortland suggests Scott, 1977). Mortland writes, "...refugees act in their new world on models that come from their old world, using strategies that are patronage- and group-based" (p.25).

Hein (1993a) presents evidence that state welfare intervention in the case of Indochinese refugees conflicts with traditional self-help organization forms. Indochinese refugees come from societies where social welfare is

---

levels of success (see for example Van Arsdale (1989); Granville & Powell (1981); Ledgerwood (1981).

accessed not through government bureaucracies, but social networks. (see for example, Henkin & Liem, 1981) . The village in the refugees new society may become the Mutual Assistance Associations with the organization and its leadership as a patron. Mortland critiques:

> The notion of refugee MAAs being democratically-organized groups responding to the needs of the community by obtaining funding to meet those needs is a myth. The reality is that Mutual Assistance Associations in the United States (SEAR and otherwise) are created by individuals in response to governmental conceptions of what should be. These individuals then perpetrate the myth of the group that is democratically-based and run in order to obtain funds while incidentally offering services. Although their activities attempt to benefit particular groups, SEAR groups often are not the groups named on MAA charters, but rather the personal clientele and extended family of the patron. In these cases it is this patron - client cluster that is the real MAA. (p. 28)

Abhay (1991) also writes of MAA leadership turning to traditional and culturally familiar governing style. Habana-Hafner (1993) has studied the bicultural organizational development of a Cambodian Mutual Assistance Association. She writes that newcomer leaders are in the process of learning western-style organizational management. A process of cross-cultural adaptation is said to take place at individual, group and organizational levels. A negotiation involving the creating, rejecting, blending and synthesizing of Cambodian and American culture shaped the organizations structures and processes as it struggled to become a bridge for its members and the American sociocultural environment. Habana-Hafner writes, "...in areas of their identity, governance and operation, they must contend with the diametrically opposed priorities of maintaining traditional ways while assimilating dominant norms."

(p.3). A balance is sought to adapt to the new environment while retaining a sense of cultural identity (Habana-Hafner, 1993, p.197).

MAAs are both the primary self-help organizations and voice of the community to the larger American community. In 1991, it is estimate that there were 1,200 Indochinese MAAs (Abhay et al. , 1991). However, the development and functioning of MAAs and new forms of leadership has been accompanied by intense conflict within the communities. Leaders through homeland qualifications, who have a strong legitimacy in the community often must give up their positions to younger, American educated leaders. When MAAs become American style and funded nonprofit organizations, sometimes community identified needs are subsumed under services (and agendas) a funding agency will support (Hein, 1995).

Pan-Asian Organization

Espiritu & Ong (1994) write, "Outside the ethnic enclaves, persons of Asian descent find themselves in political and social situations that demand that they act on a racial basis" (p. 301). Early Asian immigrants had to overcome intracommunity factions to advocate for rights. An example of this is in the late 1800s, a formal umbrella association was composed of the Chinatown district associations of California called *Zhonghua Huiguan* (Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association) was created. The main purpose was to present a unified front to the outside world and specifically to fight against anti-Chinese legislation (see Chan, 1991; Lai, 1987).

In the United States since the 1960s, Native Americans, Latino Americans, and Asian Americans have all seen panethnic formation in their communities. Espiritu (1992) defines a pan-ethnic group as "...a politico-cultural collectivity made up of peoples of several, hitherto distinct, tribal or national origins" (p. 2). Pan-ethnic American coalitions are examples of organizational responses to the U.S. racially structured categorizing system. Omi & Winant (1994) considered,

> How one is categorized is far from a merely academic or personal matter. Such matters as access to employment, housing, or other publicly or privately valued goods; social programs design and the disbursement of local, state, and federal funds; or the organization of elections (among many other issues) are directly affected by racial classification and the recognition of "legitimate" groups. (p. 3)

Despite distinctive histories in both countries of descent and in the United States, these ethnic groups come together to protect collective goals. Panethnicity creates new "ethnic" boundaries and organizational structures that transcend national origin identification (Espiritu, 1992; Lopez and Espiritu, 1990; Padilla, 1985; Nagel, 1982, 1986). Class, gender, generation, cultural differences are all subsumed. Pan-Asian organizations have sometimes disrupted the existing power structures in Asian communities.

Development of pan-Asian American organizations was in response to the US governments homogenizing racial categorization system of including more than twenty-five different Asian and Pacific Islander groups in the U.S.

under the popular term "Asian American"[36]. Espiritu & Ong (1994) wrote that the Asian racial category "...is the institutionally relevant category in the political and legal systems" (p. 301). In addition to political benefits, anti-Asian violence has also been a unifying factor. The overarching mission of pan-Asian organizations is"...to promote racial solidarity by defining economic, political, and social issues in racial terms and by presenting a unified front against the dominant society." (Espiritu & Ong, 1994, p. 302).

Organizing politically along Asian American identity, pan-Asianism, has both benefits and risks. Lowe (1991) warns that minimizing differences "underestimates differences and hybridities among Asians" (p. 30), and supports and conforms to the racist homogenizing discourse, and subsumes other identities such as gender[37].

Less powerful Asian groups such as Filipinos respond to unequal standing in pan-Asian organizations with what Espiritu and Ong (1994) call "reactive" ethnicity. Recent refugees and immigrants are both excluded from Asian American organizations due to the above mentioned class barriers and seek to remain separate from them having not yet internalized the Asian American designation (Skinner & Hendricks, 1979; Hein, 1989). Such conflicts are barriers to racial solidarity.

---

[36] Prior to the Asian American movement, some Asians practiced "ethnic disidentification"; distancing one's own group from other racial groups so as not to be mistaken and blamed for the perceived misconduct of that group (see Espiritu (1992); Hayano (1981); Daniels (1988). Times of high disidentification periods included periods affected by various exclusion acts and later during Japanese internment in World War II.

[37] See Chow (1989) for a discussion of the character of Asian American women's groups and cultural, psychological and social challenges and benefits to Asian American women feminist political organizing within feminist movements within their own ethnic communities, Asian communities, communities of color and the larger (dominantly white) feminist movement.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Another factor affecting the development of pan-Asian organization is the changing composition of the Asian American population. Before 1965, Chinese and Japanese Americans were the majority of Asian Americans. Today there are nearly 30 major ethnic groups. Sixty-six percent of Asians in the U.S. are foreign-born (Bureau of the Census, 1993). Asian American population and Indochinese groups including "new" Asian immigrant groups continue to be subject to a policy of homogenizing different Asian American groups.

The federal government used existing Asian American organizations for refugee resettlement and even distributed a booklet entitled "We, the Asian Americans" to refugees in reception camps (Hein, 1989). The newcomer not only face governmental pressure towards an "Asian American identity, but also from pan-Asian organizations that saw these newcomers as routes to government funding. Espiritu (1992) quotes Ignacio (1976), "There were many bandwagon hoppers into the Asian scene because of the novelty of the Vietnamese/ Cambodian issue and the glitter of the monies appropriated by U.S. Congress to resettle the new Vietnamese immigrants" (p. 208-209).

The majority of Indochinese refugees are first generation. As a whole, this group has neither embraced pan-Asian identity nor flocked to join pan-Asian organizations. Espiritu and Ong (1994) offered an example of a 1990 public hearing on Asian American education at California State University at Fullerton. At this meeting Indochinese refugee community representatives argued that Indochinese should be placed into a separate category for special

assistance in the higher education system. The rationale was that Indochinese refugees were the poorest group in the Asian American minority (p. 318). Vietnamese interviewed by Gold (1992) have described exploitative experiences with non-refugee Asian American employers and resettlement staff. However, he has also found that younger, American-educated Vietnamese activists believe forming coalitions with other Asian American groups to be beneficial.

Analysis

New immigrant and refugee groups are extremely diverse. They differ from existing groups, other new groups and within their own groups. Variations can be classified by ideology, religion, ethnicity, geographic region, class and occupation, experience with collectivism, and conditions of migration and settlement . The unifying thread is that every newcomer group has been racially categorized upon arrival to the U.S. Immigration law and resettlement policy are products of racially formed politics which have reshaped both the process and content of ethnic mobilization, leadership and organization. The U.S. provides resettlement transitional assistance to refugees, lessening the role of ethnic help organizations. Conversely it funds ethnic organizations to offer acculturation-aimed and cultural maintenance programs.

Current refugee resettlement programs operate within an ethnicity paradigm which presumes social and economic adaptation is dependent on the existence of ethnic communities. For Indochinese refugees who arrived in the

U.S. with no existing ethnic community in place, state intervention planned and funded the creation of MAAs. Indochinese refugees use or purport to use, American-style structures to secure government funding.

Although Indochinese refugees are not following the same path of adaptation as previous Asian American immigrants, both groups are characterized by internal diversity and multiple dynamic patterns of adaptation. Newcomers are prevented from engaging in a wholesale transfer of identity, community and organization from their homeland. There is a negotiation between retaining native country organization and leadership structures and government policy influenced structures.

Although Indochinese refugees have not widely accepted the appelation of Asian American, they can learn from the experiences those immigrant communities. Omatsu (1994) uses William's (1976) & Susman's (1973) concept of "keywords" in examining historical periods of social change. He writes that the keywords of the late 1960s and 1970s were "consciousness", "theory", "ideology", "participatory democracy", "community" , and "liberation". In contrast, he lists the keywords of the 1980s and 1990s as "advocacy", "access", "legitimacy", "empowerment", and "assertiveness" (p. 30). Omatsu (1994) calls on all Asian Americans, long-term residents and newcomers, to learn from the "elders" within the Asian American community. He advocates the definition of

empowerment espoused by Filipino immigrant labor leader Philip Vera Cruz[38]. Omatsu (1994) states, "For Vera Cruz, empowerment is a *process* where people join to develop goals and ideas to create a larger movement - a movement 'that the leadership can then build on'" (p. 61) (italics mine).

A critical understanding of the sociohistorical racially imposed boundaries to community organization and collective action is necessary for both newcomers and the policy-makers, social service servants and educators they interact with. Educational initiatives are one arena for negotiating between government goals and self-determination in the social change process. Education is not neutral. Educational initiatives funded by the state as part of immigrant/refugee resettlement policy operate within racially framed social engineering. One can become "racial curriculum literate", to become aware and critical of the agendas and historical background that have had influence in the immigrant/refugee experience. This is a prerequisite for offering federal/state sponsored resources such as refugee education to guarantee community building that serves the needs/wants of immigrants/refugees. Refugee education can support or challenge the racial identity imposed on newcomers that determines their incorporation into their new society.

[38] For a biography of Vera Cruz's life and his role in building the United Farm Workers (UFW) see Scharlin & Villanueva, 1992).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abhay, K. (1991). Leadership and management: A comparative study of mutual assistance associations. The Bridge, IRAC. Spring/Summer, 3-6.

Aguilar-San Juan, K. (1994). The state of Asian America: Activism and resistance in the 1990s. Boston: South End Press.

Apple, M. (1993). Official knowledge, democratic education in a conservative age. New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. (1995). Education and power (2nd ed.). New York: Rutledge.,

Armstrong, P. (1988). L'Ordine Nuovo: The legacy of Antonio Gramsci and the education of adults. International Journal of Lifelong Education, 7(4), 249-259.

Assante, M. (1988). Afrocentricity. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Presss.

Barth, F. (1969). Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. Boston: Little Brown.

Bernard, W. (1977). Immigrants and refugees: Their similarities, differences and needs. International Migration, 14(4), 267-281.

Blauner, R. (1972). Racial Oppression in America. New York: Harper & Row.

Bonacich, E. (1972). A theory of ethnic antagonism: The split labor market. American Sociological Review, 37 (5):547-59.

Bonacich, E. (1980). Class approaches to ethnicity and race. The Insurgent Sociologist, 10 (2), 9-23.

Bonacich, E. & Modell, J. (1980). The economic basis of ethnic solidarity: Small business in the Japanese-American community. Berkley: University of California Press.

Breton, R. (1964). Institutional completeness of ethnic communities and the personal relations of immigrants. American Journal of Sociology, 70, 193-205.

Browne, B. (1985). A common thread: American images of the Chinese and J apanese, 1930-1960. Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 05.

Bureau of the Census. (1993). We the American...Asians. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.

Caplan, N., Whitmore, J., Bui, Q. (1985). Southeast Asian refugee self-sufficiency study. Report prepared for Office of Refugee Resettlement by the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Carmichael, S. & Hamilton, C. (1967). Black power. New York: Random House/Vintage Books.

Center for Applied Linguistics. (1994). A Guide to resettlement in the United States. Washington, DC: CAL.

Chan,S. (1991). Asian Americans: An interpretive history. Boston: Twayne Publishers.

Chrisman, R & Hare, N. (1974). Pan-Africanism. Indianapolis and New York: Praeger.

Chow, E. (1989). The feminist movement: Where are all the Asian American women? In Asian Women United of California, Making Waves: An anthology of writing by and about Asian American women. Boston: Beacon.

Cohen, A. (1981). Variables of ethnicity. In C. Keyes (Ed.), Ethnic change. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Comaroff, J. (1987). Of totemism and ethnicity. Ethnos, 52 (3-4), 301-23.

Cox, O. (1948). Caste, class, and race. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Cruse, H. (1967). The crisis of the Negro intellectual. New York: William Morrow

Cruce, H. (1968). Rebellion or revolution? New York: William Morrow.

Daniels, R. (1988). Asian America: Chinese and Japanese in the United States since 1850. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Desbarats, J (1985). Indochinese resettlement in the United States. Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 4, 522-28.

de Voe, D. (1981). Framing refugees as clients. International Migration Review, 15 (1), 88-94.

Dinnerstein, L. & Reimers, D. (1975). Ethnic America: A history of immigration and assimilation. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company.

Dinnerstein, L. (1982). America and the survivors of the Holocaust. New York: Columbia University Press.

Du Bois, W. (1948). Is man free? Scientific Monthly, 66, 432-34.

Du Bois, W. (1989). The souls of black folk. New York: Penguin. (Original work published 1903)

Du Bois, W. (1978). The conservation of races. In D. Green & E. Driver (Eds). W.E.B. DuBois on sociology and the black community. Chicago: University of Chicago Press . (Original work published 1897)

Espiritu, Y. (1989). Beyond the "Boat People": Ethnicization of American life. Amerasia, 15 (2), 49-67.

Espiritu, Y. (1992). Asian American panethnicity: Bridging Institutions and identities. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Espiritu, Y. & Ong, P. (1994). Class restraints on racial solidarity among Asian Americans. In P. Ong, E. Bonacich, & L. E. Cheng (Eds.), The new Asian immigration in Los Angeles and global restructuring. Philadelphia : Temple University Press.

Fagerlind, I. & Saha, L. (1983). Education and National Development: A comparative perspective. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Fanon, F. (1963). The wretched of the earth. New York: Grove Press.

Farber, D. (1987). Seeking refuge in the U.S.A. Millertown, NY: Aperature.

Farley, R. & Bianchi, S. (1983). The growing gap between blacks. American Demographics, 5, 15-18.

Feagin, J. & Feagin, C. (1996). Racial and ethnic relations. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Finnan, C. & Cooperstein, R. (1983). Southeast Asian refugee resettlement at the local level. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.

Forgacs, D. (1988). A Gramsci reader. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Friedman, M. (1962). Capitalism and freedom. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gallagher, D., Forbes, S. & Fagen, P. (1985). Of special humanitarian concern: U.S. refugee admissions since passage of the Refugee Act. Washington, DC: Refugee Policy Group.

Gans, H. (1979). Symbolic ethnicity: The future of ethnic group and cultures in America. Ethnic and Racial Studies, 2, 1-20.

Geertz, C. (1962). The rotating credit association: A 'Middle Rung' in development. Economic Development and Cultural Change, 10: 241-263.

Giroux, H. & Aronowitz, S. (1995). Education still under siege. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Giroux, H. & McLauren, P. (1989). Critical pedagogy, the state, and cultural struggle. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Glazer, N. (1968). Slums and ethnicity. In T. Sherrard (Ed.,) Social welfare and urban problems. New York: Columbia Univerisity Press.

Glazer, N. & Moynihan, D. (1970). Beyond the melting pot. (2nd ed.). Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.

Gold, S. (1988). Refugees and small business: The case of Soviet Jews and Vietnamese. Ethnic and Racial Studies, 11(4), 411-434.

Gold, S. (1989). Differential adjustment among new immigrant family members. Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 17 (4), 408-434.

Gold, S. (1992). Refugee communities: A comparative field study. Newbury Park, CA: Sage publications.

Gordon, M. (1964). Assimilation in American life. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gordon, D. , Edwards, R. & Reich, M. (1982). Segmented work, divided workers: The historical transformation of labor in the United States. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gould, S. (1981). The mismeasure of man. New York: W.W. Norton.

Gramsci, A. (1971). Selections from the prison notebooks (Q. Hoare & G. Smith, Trans. & Eds.). New York: International Publishers.

Granville, K. & Powell, T. (1981). Issues related to development of mutual assistance programs among Indochinese refugees. Paper presented at the National Conference on Social Welfare, San Francisco, CA.

Greeley, A. (1974). Ethnicity in the United States. New York: John Wiley.

Greene, J. (1981). Science, ideology, and worldview. Berkley: University of California Press.

Habana-Hafner, S. (1993). Samakon Khmer: The cross-cultural adaptation of a newcomer ethnic organization (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1993). Dissertation Abstracts International, 54, 02A.

Haines, D. (Ed.). (1985). Refugees in the U.S: A reference handbook. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Hall, S. (1986). Gramsci's relevance for the study of race and ethnicity. Journal of Communication Inquiry, 10, 5-27.

Hayano, D. (1981). Ethnic identification and disidentification: Japanese-American views of Chinese-Americans. Ethnic Groups, 3 (2), 157-171.

Hein, J. (1991). Indochinese refugees' responses to resettlement via the social welfare system. In S. Hune, et al., (Eds.). Asian Americans: Comparative and global perspectives. Pullman, WA: Washington State University Press.

Hein, J. (1993a). States and international migrants: The incorporation of Indochinese refugees in the United States and France. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Hein, J. (1993b). Refugees, immigrants, and the state. Annual Review of Sociology, 19, 43-59.

Hein, J. (1993c). International Migrants or welfare clients: The selection of a master status for Indochinese refugees by American Voluntary agencies. Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 20 (1), 115-130.

Hein, J. (1995). From Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia: A refugee experience in the United States. New York: Twayne.

Higham, J. (1955). Strangers in the land: Patterns of American nativism 1860-1925. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Hirayama, K. & Hirayama, H,. (1988). Stress, social supports, and adaptational patterns in Hmong refugee families. Amerasia Journal, 14, 93-108.

Ignacio, L. (1976). Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders (Is there such an ethnic group?) San Jose: Pilipino Development Associates.

Immigration overhaul. (1996, October). Migration News, [on-line serial], 3 (10).

Indochina Resource Action Center (1988). Understanding the Southeast Asian mutual assistance associations. Washtinton, DC: IRAC.

Institute for Asian Studies (1988). Thailand: A first asylum country for Indochinese refugees. Bangkok: Institute Asian Studies, Chulalongkorn University.

Jenkins, S. (1988). Conclusion: The state and the associations. In S. Jenkins (Ed.), Ethnic Associations and the welfare state: Services to immigrants in five countries. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kallen, H. (1924). Culture and Democracy in America. New York: Boni and Liveright.

Kelly, G. (1977). From Vietnam to America: A chronicle of the Vietnamese immigration to the United States. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Kennedy, E. (1981). Refugee act of 1980. International Migration Review, 15(1-2), 141-156.

Keyes, C. (1977). The golden peninsula: Culture and adaptation in mainland Southeast Asia. New York: Macmillan Press.

Kibrai, N. (1993). Family Tightrope: The changing lives of Vietnamese Americans. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kim, I. (1981). New urban immigrants: The Korean community in New York. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kunz, E. (1973). The refugee in flight: Kinetic models and forms of displacement. International Migration Review, 13, 125-146.

Kwong, P. (1987). The new Chinatown. New York: Hill & Wang.

Lai, H. (1987). Historical development of the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association/Huiguan system. In Chinese Historical Society of America, Chinese America: History and perspectives. San Francisco: Chinese Historical Society of America.

Le, K. & Bui, D. (1981). The Indochinese mutual assistance associations in the 1980s: Roles and responsibilities. Paper presented at the National Governor's Association Refugee Resettlement Conference, Washington, D.C.

Ledgerwood, J. (1986). Portrait of a conflict: Exploring Cambodian-American social and political relationships. Paper presented at the Southeast Asian Studies Summer Study Institute Meetings, Rochester, NY.

Lee, J. (1994). Identity and social dynamics in ethnic community: Comparative study on boundary making among Asian Americans in Philadelphia. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1994). Dissertation Abstracts International, 55, 09.

Lee, T. (1991). Trapped in a pedestal. In J. Kromkowski (Ed.), Race and ethnic relations 91/92. Guilford, CT: Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc.

Legum, C. (1965). Pan Africanism: A short political guide. London: Pall Mall Press.

Leibowitz, A. (1983). The refugee act of 1980: Problems and congressional concerns. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 467, 163-171.

Lieberson, S. & Waters, M. (1985). Ethnic Mixtures in the Unites States. Sociology and Social Research 70:43-53.

Light, I. (1972). Ethnic enterprise in America: Business and welfare among Chinese, Japanese and Blacks. Berkley: University of California Press.

Light, I. (1980). Asian entrepreneurs in America. In S. Cummings (Ed.), Self help in urban America: Patterns of minority business enterprise. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press.

Light, I. & Bhachu, P. (Eds.). (1993). Immigration and entrepreneurship: Culture, capital, and ethnic networks. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers

Liu, J. (1976). Towards an understanding of the internal colonial model. In E. Gee (Ed.), Counterpoint: Perspectives on Asian-America. University of California: Asian-American Studies Center.

Loescher, G. & Scanlan, J. (1986). Calculated kindness: Refugees and America's half-open door, 1945-present. New York: Free Press.

Lopez, D. & Espiritu, Y. (1990). Panethnicity in the United States: A theoretical framework. Ethnic and Racial Studies, 13 (2), 198-224.

Lowe, L. (1991). Heterogeneity, Hybridity, Multiplicity: Marking Asian American differences. Diaspora, Spring, 24-44.

Macedo, D. (1994). Literacies of power: What Americans are not allowed to know. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Massachusetts Office for Refugees and Immigrants. (1993). Refugee and immigrant community development institute request for proposals: Fiscal year 1994. Boston: Commonwealth of Massachusetts Executive Office of Health and Human Services.

Massachusetts Office of Refugee Resettlement. (1994). Report to the Congress: Refugee Resettlement Program FY 1994. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Massey, D., Alarcon, R., Durand, J, & Gonzalez, H. (1987). Return to Aztlan. Berkeley: University of California Press.

McCarthy, C. (1990). Multicultural education, minority identities, textbooks, and the challenge of curriculum reform. Journal of Education, 172 (2), 118-129.

McCarthy, C. & Crichlow, W. (Eds.). (1993). Race, identity and representation in education. New York: Routledge.

Mortland, C. (1993). Patron-client relations and the evolution of mutual assistance associations. In Arsdale, P. (Ed.), Refugee empowerment and organizational change: A systems perspective. Arlington, VA: American Anthropological Association.

Nagel, J. (1982). The political mobilization of Native Americans. Social Science Journal, 19, 37-45.

Nagel, J. (1986). The political construction of ethnicity. In S. Olzak & J. Nagel (Eds.), Competitive ethnic relations. San Diego: Academic Press.

Nguyen, L. & Henkin, A. (1984). Vietnamese refugees in the United States: Adaptation and transition status. Journal of Ethnic Studies, 9 (4), 110-116.

Office for Refugees and Immigrants. (1990). Through the golden door: Impacts of non-citizen residents on the Commonwealth. Boston: Office of Refugees and Immigrants (prepared for the Massachusetts Legislature).

Okamura, J. (1983). Filipino hometown associations in Honolulu. Ethnology, 22, 341-353.

Olzak, S. (1985). Ethnicity and ethnic collective behavior. In L. Kriesberg (Ed.), Research in social movements, conflict and change. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Olzak, S. & Nagel, J. (eds.). (1986). Competitive Ethnic Relations. San Diego: Academic Press.

Olzak, S. (1992). The dynamics of ethnic competition and conflict. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Omatsu, G. (1994). The 'Four Prisons' and the movements of liberation: Asian American Activism from the 1960s to the 1990s. In K. Aguilar-San Juan (Ed.), The state of Asian America: Activism and resistance in the 1990s. Boston: South End Press.

Omi, M. & Winant, H. (1994). Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Osajima, K. (1988). Asian Americans as the model minority: An analysis of the popular press image in the 1960s and 1980s. In G. Okihiro, S. Hune, A. Hansen, & J. Liu (Eds.), Reflections on shattered windows: Promises and prospects for Asian American studies. Pullman, WA: Washington State University Press.

Padilla, F. (1985). Latino ethnic consciousness: The case of Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans in Chicago. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Park, R. (1950). Race and culture. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Portes, A. & Bach, R. (1985). Latin Journey: Cuban and Mexican immigrants in the United States. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Portes, A. & Manning, R. (1986). The immigrant enclave: Theory and empirical examples. In Olzak, S. & Nagel, J. (Eds.), Competitive ethnic relations. San Diego: Academic Press.

Portes, A. & Rumbaut, R. (1990). Immigrant America: A portrait. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Reimers, D. (1985). Still the golden door: The Third World comes to America. New York: Columbia University Press.

Roediger, D. (1992). Gook: The short history of an Americanism. Monthly Review, 43 (10), 50-54.

Rutledge, P. (1992). The Vietnamese experience in America. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Said, E. (1978). Orientalism. New York: Random House.

San Juan, E. Jr. (1992). Racial formations/critical transformations: Articulations of power in ethnic and racial studies in the United States. Atlantic Highands, NJ: Humanities Press.

Scharlin, C. & Villanueva, L. (1992). Philip Vera Cruz: A personal history of Filipino immigrants and the farmworkers movement. Los Angeles: UCLA Labor Center and UCLA Asian American Studies Center.

Scott, J. (1977). Patron-Client politics and political change in Southeast Asia. In Schmidt, et al., (Eds.). Friends, followers, and factions: A reader in political clientism. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Shor, I. (1986). Culture wars: School and society in the conservative restoration. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Skinner, K. & Hendricks, G. (1979). The shaping of self-identity among Indochinese refugees. Journal of Ethnic Studies, 7, 25-41.

Skinner, K. (1980). Vietnamese in America: Diversity in adaptation. California Sociologist, 3 (2), 103-124.

Slotkin, J. (Ed.). (1965). Reading in early anthropology. London: Methuen & Co.

Smedley, A. (1993). Race in North America: Origin and evolution of a worldview. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Sowell, T. (1981). Ethnic America: A history. New York: Basic Books.

Stein, B. (1981). Refugee resettlement programs and techniques. In U.S. immigration policy and the natioal interest, Appendix C to the staff report of the select commission on immigration and refugee policy, papers on refugees. Washington, DC.

Stein, B. (1986). Durable solutions to developing country refugees. International Migration Review, 20, 264-282.

Steinberg, S. (1989). The ethnic myth. Boston: Beacon Press.

Stocking, G. (Ed.). (1974). The shaping of American anthropology, 1883-1911: A Franz Boas Reader. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Strand, P. & Jones, W. (1985). Indochinese refugees in America: Problems of adaptation and assimilation. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Susman, W. (1973). Culture as history: The transformation of American society in the twentieth century. New York: Pantheon Books.

Taft, J., North, D. & Ford, D. (1980). Refugee resettlement in the United States. Washington, DC: New Transcentury Foundation.

Takagi, D. (1992). The retreat from race : Asian-American admissions and racial politics. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Takaki, R. (1989). Strangers from a different shore. New York: Penguin Books.

Takaki, R. (1994). Reflections on racial patterns in America. In R. Takaki (Ed.), From different shores: Perspectives on race and ethnicity in America. New York: Oxford University Press.

Van Arsdale, P. (1989). Mutual assistance associations: Bane or boon to refugee cultural adjustment? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for Applied Anthropology, Santa Fe, NM.

van den Berghe, P. (1976). Ethnic pluralism in industrial societies: A social case, ETHNOS, 3, 242-255.

Walsh, K. (1996). Education reform and social change: Multicultural voices, struggles, and visions. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wang, L. (1989, March 9). Report on anti-Asian bias in UC admissions process seriously flawed. East/West.

Waters, M. (1990). Ethnic Options: Choosing identities in America. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Weber, M. (1978). Economy and society (Vol. I). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wei, W. (1993). The Asian American movement. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Williams, R. (1976). Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society (rev. ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, W. (1978). The declining significance of race (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wilson, W. (1987). The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Woldemikael, T. (1987). Assertion versus accommodation: A comparative approach to intergroup relations. American Behavioral Scientist, 30 (4), 411-428.

Woo, E. (1988, November 19). UCLA denies any policy of limiting Asian admissions. Los Angeles Times.

Wright, R. (1981). Voluntary agencies and the resettlement of refugees. International Migration Review, 15, 157-174.

Yancey, W. Eugene, E. & Juliani, R. (1976). Emergent ethnicity: A review and reformulation. American Sociological Review, 41, 391-403.

Yinger, M. (1985). Ethnicity. Annual Review of Sociology, 11,151-180.

Zucker, N. & Zucker, N. (1989). The uneasy troika in U.S. refugee policy: foreign policy, pressure groups, and resettlement costs. Journal of Refugee Studies, 3, 359-72.

Zucker, N. & Zucker, N. (1987). The guarded gate: The reality of American refugee policy. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.